

UCT-A A13

REMARKS

The application now contains claims 55-58, 61-63, 65-67, 69-71, 73-75 and 77-82.

Claim 56 is indicated above as being amended. However, this amendment is made to correct a typographical error in the claim that was made in the previous amendment. The claim now reads "6 micrometers" as it should have in the previous listing of the claims.

In the above referenced office action, the Examiner rejected claims 55-58, 65-67, 69-71, 73-75 and 77-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent 05-242721 and Ray.

The Examiner is correct that the JP reference does teach the use of tiny flakes having a dimension of 0.5 microns for use in a toner particle for electrophotography. However, the metal in these particles is used to provide a conductive path on a printed circuit board, and not for decorative purposes. Thus, the statement of the Examiner that "The use of metallic particles in obtaining sparkle color or iridescence or lustre is *further* taught by ray... " is somewhat misleading since the Japanese reference does not teach any of these features.

The Examiner indicates that it would have been obvious to "utilize such image enhancing metal flakes in a printed image, a mixture for printing in either a liquid or solid format such metal flakes in providing a toner for developing latent electrostatic images."

Applicants believe that this statement has been somewhat garbled in printing and have some difficulty in understanding exactly what combination the Examiner is asserting.

If the Examiner is suggesting taking the flakes of Ray and using them in the toner of the JP reference, then there is no motivation to do so, since the JP reference does not need the large size flakes for conduction purposes and may, in fact, have some reason for desiring small flakes.

If the Examiner is suggesting using the metal particles of the JP reference (0.4 micrometers), then the result would not be the toner of the present claim 55.

As far as applicants can see no obvious combination of the JP reference and Ray would meet the limitations of claim 55.

Furthermore, applicants submit that Ray himself appears to have considered the use of flakes of a large enough size dispersed in a polymer and come to the conclusion that it is not possible.

In general, the desired luster enhancing toner taught by ray comprises coated *single* flakes as a toner as described at, for example, col. 8, line 28, et. seq. Ray does mention the possibility of extruding a mixture of metal flakes with toner polymers and pulverizing the extruded mixture and/or mixing flakes with resin in a high shear mixer to form particles. (col. 7, line 20-30 and 40-


UCT-A A13

50). However, Ray makes clear that doing any of the above will crumble the flakes and reduce their size. Ray comes to the conclusion that only coating of single flakes will do the job. Thus, Ray not only teaches away from doing what the Examiner indicates is obvious, but teaches that when it is done, the flake particles are small and not as claimed in claim 55.

Applicants submit that the present claims are patentable over the cited art. Notice to this effect is respectfully awaited. If the Examiner has any questions, he is respectfully requested to call Dr. Paul Fenster at 1 (877) 428-5468. Please note that this is a direct *toll free* number in the US that is answered in the undersigned's Israel office. Israel is 7 hours ahead of Washington.

In the event that the Examiner continues his rejections under the art cited, he is respectfully requested to provide reasoning as to motivation for combining and how, technically, based on the references, a combination is possible and obvious in order to produce the claimed invention.

Respectfully submitted,
Benzion LANDA, et al.


Paul Fenster
Reg. No. 33,877

December 30, 2003

William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650